

### IN THE CLAIMS

Please amend Claim 9 as follows:

9. (Twice Amended) A process as claimed in claim 1, wherein the reaction is passed over a protective bed wherein catalyst poisons are removed, prior to the reaction.

### DISCUSSION OF THE AMENDMENT

The specification has been amended so that the description of the figures conforms to the designations on the figures themselves, i.e., Fig. 1A and Fig. 1B.

Claim 9 has been amended to recite the function of the protective bed, as supported in the specification at page 6, lines 18-19.

No new matter has been added by the above amendment. Claims 1-9 remain pending in the application.

### REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' attorney and the assignee's representative during interview held August 14, 2002,<sup>1</sup> in the above-identified application. During the interview, Applicants' attorney explained the presently-claimed invention and why it is patentable over the applied prior art. The discussion is summarized and expanded upon below.

The rejection of Claims 1-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. 5,849,972 (Vicari et al) in view of U.S. 5,243,118 (Sanderson et al), is respectfully traversed.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Interview Summary incorrectly lists the date as "01 February 0814." The Examiner is respectfully requested to correct the record.